COPY OF PAPERS-ORIGINALLY FILED



OF

[10191/1157]

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant(s)

Klaus ZIMMERMAN et al.

Serial No.

09/432,338 (CPA)

Filed

November 2, 1999

For

METHOD AND DEVICE FOR ACTIVATING

AN ELECTROMAGNETIC CONSUMER

Art Unit

3754

Examiner

Eric Keasel

I haveby contify that this correspondence is being deposited with Unded States Postal Service as first class easil in an invisional action in

Commissioner of Patents and Trademerks, Windows D.C. Danielle

Assistant Commissioner

for Patents

Washington D.C. 20231

Aity's Signature

RICHARD L. MAYER KENTON & KENTON

TRANSMITTAL

SIR:

Transmitted herewith for filing in the above-identified patent application is a Response to the Office Action mailed on March 19, 2002.

This is also a Petition To Extend Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) to extend the threemonth response date by two months from June 19, 2002 to August 19, 2002.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge the appropriate fee, which is believed to be \$400.00 for the two-month extension, to Deposit Account No. 11-0600, and is also authorized, as appropriate and/or necessary, to charge any additional fees (including any other Rule 136(a) extension fees) or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-0600. Two duplicate copies of this transmittal letter are enclosed for these purposes.

7/24/06

Respectfully submitted,

Richard L. Mayer

(Reg. No. 22,490)

KENYON & KENYON One Broadway New York, New York 10004 (212) 425-7200

CUSTOMER NO. 26646

496574

copy of papers ORIGINALLY FILED

[10191/1157]

PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant(s)

Klaus ZIMMERMAN et al.

Serial No.

09/432,338 (CPA)

Filed

November 2, 1999

For

METHOD AND DEVICE FOR ACTIVATING

AN ELECTROMAGNETIC CONSUMER

Art Unit

3754

Examiner

early carridy that this correspondence is being deposited with it class will a so amelous address. Eric Keasel & States Postel Service ST Wenthappen D.C. 2016 an

Assistant Commissioner for Patents

Washington, D.C. 20231

AUG - 9 2002

RESPONSE

Signature

TECHNOLOGY CENTER R3700

SIR:

In response to the Office Action mailed on March 19, 2002, please reconsider the above-identified application based on the following:

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 7 are now pending.

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. Claims 1-7 were rejected under the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112. Claims 1-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 1-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,017,017 to Lutz ("Lutz"). Claims 1-7 further were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,942,892 to Li ("Li"). Claims 1-7 further were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,738,071 to Smith, Jr. et al. ("Smith"). Claims 1-7 further were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,583,434 to